

Name : Kevin Kightlinger, CSULB student

Title of Article: **How Public Leaders Change Multiple Systems**

Reducing Costs and Improving Outcomes

Through Supportive Housing

Date: November 15-16, 2004

1. Please describe the goal of the project/program found in the article/report?

This article is a proposal from the Corporation for Supportive Housing written for state and local officials with recommendations regarding how to override existing bureaucratic boundaries by identifying alternative coalition builders. The processes discussed in this paper focused on raising funds from existing public and private projects to create new supportive (multiple service care) housing for their chronically homeless populations. The article also includes three examples of success in changing policy and funding for the homeless 1. Connecticut's Supportive Housing PILOTS Initiative of the late 1990s; 2. Minnesota's 1996 Hearth Connection; and San Francisco's 1994 creation of their Health, Housing, and Integrated Services Network.

2. What were the key points?

The key points were a discussion of tactics used to generate momentum for initial and sustainable financial support. A main persuasion tactic listed was for support seekers not to approach public leaders unless they had persuasive data to show that addressing homelessness would cut costs in areas of concern to them. A recurring example was the issue of health care which shoulders more expensive burdens of care when so many people are not proactively treated by a new system of supportive housing.

3. Is this a proposal or an existing project/program? If the project/program was completed, what were the outcomes? If it is a proposal, what are the expected outcomes?

This article is a proposal for more change based on the success of the other programs. These successful outcomes generated more construction of supportive housing. The projects are self-perpetuating due in part to the well documented progress assessments given to public and private fund providers which generated more attention and funding for project sustainability and growth.

4. Who was involved and how did they meet the project goals?

In all cases the Corporation for Supportive Housing was involved as a catalyst. However the successful results were generated by a cooperative mix of high level public officials in budgetary departments for health and housing services, participants in the current systems caring for the homeless and private citizen

groups all networking around any bureaucratic roadblocks over extended periods of time.

5. How was it funded? How much did it cost?

This individual proposal was issued at the CSH Supportive Housing Leadership Forum in Washington, DC. The initial costs for the services of CSH were not listed but the example projects listed in the proposal noted millions of dollars allocated to these new projects.

6. Any pertinent statistics found?

Census data was used in San Francisco to get homelessness estimates. No other statistical data were presented and the article goes on to state that even "ad hoc" data collected by current care providers was still credible in presenting reasons for change to supportive housing.

7. Any unique approaches to ending homelessness identified?

The "social innovation approach" was the name given to this process of bypassing bureaucratic obstacle in order to generate funds for supportive housing. It was also suggested that it could also work on other under-funded social issues such as "...the elderly, people with developmental disabilities or mental illness, and high risk families" (2:2004).

8. Any questions raised by this plan?

What led to the initial choice of how many units to build? Was it part of a 10 year plan or structured on short-term funds made available after the initial campaign?

9. Potential goals to include in the matrix?

- a) List which allies to seek within the homeless systems.
- b) Define "mainstream resources" in targeting new funds.
- c) Learn exactly which government officials and agencies have jurisdiction and how they might overlap.
- d) There are other organizations besides the Corporation for Supportive Housing, who are they? What are their approaches?